

App. No. 10/800,056  
Amendment Dated: July 27, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of April 27, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 27 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-25 were rejected by the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkett et al. (hereinafter Burkett), US Patent No. 6,635,089, and further in view of Subramaniam et al. (hereinafter Subramaniam), US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0140731. The Applicants respectfully disagree and present the following for consideration. Claims 1, 2, 3, 11, 13 and 20 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections

The Office Action argues that Burkett discloses the recitations found within the independent claims (1, 11 and 20). The Office Action states, however, that "Burkett does not explicitly disclose cloning a portion of the tree structure; and displaying a UI output according to the tree structure." The Office Action argues that Burkett inherently discloses these recitations "[s]ince Burkett discloses substitute one portion of the tree with different data (Figs. 4A-4E and col. 9, line 44 - col. 12, line 4: dynamically constructed nodes 421a, 422a and 423a in Fig. 4E have been substituted for nodes 415, 126 and its subtree comprised of nodes 417, 418a, 418b, and 419)." The Applicants respectfully disagree. Substitution is not the same as cloning. Substitution is the replacement of data with other data such that the original data is no longer present. Cloning on the other hand creates a copy. While the Applicants submit that the claims are allowable as presented, the Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly define the invention and to further the prosecution of this matter

App. No. 10/800,056

Amendment Dated: July 27, 2006

Reply to Office Action of April 27, 2006

Claim 1 as amended recites “generating a tree structure that corresponds to the UI script; accessing a reference template; cloning the reference template to create a cloned reference template while maintaining the reference template; inserting the data into the cloned reference template; grafting the cloned reference template into the tree structure after the data has been inserted into the cloned reference template; and displaying a UI output according to the tree structure, whereby the UI output is dynamically updated with the data.”

Among other differences, Claim 1 teaches “cloning the reference template to create a cloned reference template while maintaining the reference template.” As amended, it is clear that data is not merely substituted within the tree. Instead, a reference template is cloned “while maintaining the reference template.” Additionally, none of the cited references teach or suggest “inserting the data into the cloned reference template” and “grafting the cloned reference template into the tree structure after the data has been inserted into the cloned reference template” as recited in Claim 1. In contrast, Burkett substitutes one portion of the tree with the retrieved data when it is obtained instead of “grafting the cloned reference template into the tree structure after the data has been inserted into the cloned reference template.” Independent Claims 11 and 20 have been similarly amended and are allowable for at least the above reasons.

In addition to the above differences, Independent Claim 11 has been amended to include the recitation “wherein generating the tree structure includes removing any templates that were previously grafted to the tree.” None of the cited references disclose removing any portion of the tree that “were previously grafted to the tree.” As shown above, the cited references teach substituting data into the tree.

App. No. 10/800,056

Amendment Dated: July 27, 2006

Reply to Office Action of April 27, 2006

### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Timothy P. Sullivan

Registration No. 47,981

Direct Dial: 206.342.6254

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P. O. Box 2903

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903

206.342.6200

**27488**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE